Message from the Legislative Council.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I report to the House that a Message has been received from the Legislative Council that the Madras Tenants and Ryots Protection (Mysore Amendment) Bill, 1954, passed by the Assembly during the current session and transmitted to the Council has been passed by the Council without any amendments.

Business of the House.

Statement by the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We commenced this session on the 11th October 1954 and till this date we have met for 12 days. During this period one day was taken for non-official business. The remaining 11 days were utilised for Government Business. 652 questions were tabled by Members. Of these, 644 questions were admitted by the Chair. Answers have been furnished to Members to 392 questions. Answers to 93 questions have since been received from Government. There thus remain 159 questions unanswered by the Government. Eight Short Notice Questions were tabled. Out of them, four were disallowed by the Chair and for another four consent of the Ministers concerned was not given. Thus all the eight Short Notice questions were disallowed.

Coming to non-official business, of the 100 resolutions tabled 98 were admitted by the Chair. Two resolutions were discussed on the floor of the House and withdrawn.

Statement showing information relating to questions tabled for the previous sessions of Legislative Assembly.

Questions admitted from Budget Session 1952 to Budget Session 1954.	...	3,077
Answers furnished to the above questions.	...	3,031
Questions remaining unanswered by Government.	...	46

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—Personal Inam Bill ಕಳೆದ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರವಾಯಿತು. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಒಂದು Communication ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರೆಸಿಡೆಂಟರು ಅನುಮತಿ ಕೊಡದೆ ತಡೆ ಹಿಡಿದಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಬಂದಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಮುಂದಿನ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವೇನು ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೋರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is he prepared to answer?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—Sir, the Mysore Personal Inams Abolition Bill was passed by both Houses of Legislature and is pending before the President for his assent. The matter is under correspondence. I do not want to say anything more at this stage.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ನಾಗರ-ಹೊಸನಗರ).—ನಾನು ತಾಳಗುಂದ ಪ್ರಕರಣದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ರೂಲ್ 39ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೆ. ಅದು sub-judice ಎಂಬ ಕಾರಣದ ಮೇಲೆ disallow ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಉತ್ತರ ಒದಗಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಕೊಡುವಾಗ 20ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖು ತಾಳಗುಂದದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ತ್ರೀಯರ ಮೇಲೆ ಪೋಲೀಸರು ಅತ್ಯಾಚಾರ ನಡೆಸಲಿಲ್ಲ, ಅದು ಶುದ್ಧ ನಿರಾಧಾರವಾದ ಅಂಶ, ಅದು ಬರೀ ರಾಜಕೀಯ ಅಪಪ್ರಚಾರವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ನಾನು challenge ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ದಯಮಾಡಿ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಿನಂತಿ.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA (Channarayapatna).—I had given notice of a short notice question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have disallowed it; the Hon'ble Member may take another opportunity to ventilate his grievance.

*Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug)—Sir, I am not questioning the ruling of the Chair but I would like to draw the Chair's attention to the fact that when that question was taken up for answers on the particular day the Minister said that the subject-matter of the question was *sub judice* and therefore he was not in a position to answer. When it was clarified later that we were referring to matters that happened on 24th and not on the 23rd, the Minister was pleased to answer that all these questions were put by Sri Gopala Gowda and others. When that is the case, when the question

(SRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY.)

does not relate to a case pending before the court, it cannot be *sub judice*. And when the Minister went on answering in the manner in which he did, it is extremely desirable that such answers that have been given by the Minister or the Government should not go unchallenged and therefore Sri S. Gopala Gowda wanted to take an opportunity to discuss the question under Rule 39.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am aware of the fact and also the answers given by the Government. I have given my ruling so far as that question is concerned. Hon'ble Member will have many opportunities for discussing that question also. The facts are in dispute. You should take the answers furnished by the Government and, if you still feel that the answers furnished are not correct, you should take another opportunity.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—Will I be allowed to make a statement, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not now.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—I had tabled a short notice question. I have not received any answer to that question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think a reply has been sent. What is the question about?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—In Hassan District, some primary school teachers have been relieved on certain grounds. The issue is an important one which has to be decided. I do not know what the answer is from the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER.—May I know whether any communication has been received from the office in regard to this question?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—No, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will then find out.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA (Basavangudi).—About Law College and the Commerce College I had tabled a short notice question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—With regard to short notice questions, I made a statement just now. Eight questions were given notice of, of which four were admitted by the Chair and were sent to the Ministers concerned for consent to answer. Their consent is necessary under the rules. Therefore I cannot do anything. And the Ministers have not agreed to answer them. Therefore all the four questions were disallowed by virtue of the rules.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molakalmuru).—In view of the position, is it not better that they should not send in short notice questions?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is a matter of opinion. There are rules to govern them. Even the Chair is governed by rules. Unless the Minister concerned agrees to answer, the question cannot be admitted. Therefore it is left to the House to amend the rules and place them before the House.

***Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM** (Jagalur).—Am I to understand that the Ministers refused to answer all the short notice questions? I think that is a very unusual procedure. It raises important issues. I submit to the Chair that it is better to intimate the House what fate has befallen on the short notice questions that have been tabled so that we may take some other steps. But I submit this is the first time I think that all the short notice questions have not received the attention which they ought to have and I regret very much that the Ministers have not thought it fit it comply with our request. This at once raises serious doubts about those questions. Either the questions are very important or they are inconvenient ones for them to answer.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—They may not have the time to answer.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—No, no. It does not speak well of the Ministers, nor is it complimentary to the Ministers and it gives rise to a suspicion that the Ministers . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—Without knowing the reasons I do not think it is right for the Hon'ble Member to say that.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I find that all short notice questions sent to Government have not received the attention which they have to receive. It then certainly raises a presumption...

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think Hon'ble Members have also received replies and the reasons are made known to them.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—So far as short notice questions are concerned,

though the Speaker allowed them, by the fact that the Ministers concerned have not thought it fit to comply with our request, I can only conclude that there is something fishy . . .

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Short notice questions are governed by rule 34.

"(1) A question relating to a matter of public importance may be asked with shorter notice than fifteen clear days and if the Speaker is of opinion that the question is of an urgent character and is otherwise admissible under the rules, he may admit it with the consent of the Minister concerned.

(2) If the Minister concerned agrees to reply, such question shall be answered on a day to be indicated by him and shall be called immediately after the questions which have appeared on the list of questions for answer have been disposed of.

(3) The Member who has given notice of the question shall read the question when called by the Speaker and the Ministers concerned shall give a reply immediately.

(4) In other respects, the procedure for short notice questions shall be the same as for ordinary questions for answer, with such modifications as the Speaker may consider necessary or convenient."

Sir, as you are aware, short notice questions are tabled by members if they relate to a matter of public or State importance. When such is the position, when some members table short notice questions and they have been admitted by the Chair, I really cannot understand why Ministers refuse to answer them. They must make it a point to answer all those questions; otherwise, a right that has been conceded under the rules would be denied to the Members.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I reliably learn that these questions have been refused to be answered on the ground of want of time.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Sir, you were pleased to say . . .

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—Then, when were these questions tabled, the dates on which they were admitted by the Chair and the dates on which they were sent to the Ministers for compliance? That would facilitate us to know whether time was really short to answer them.

*Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—You were pleased to say that 8 questions were tabled and out of them 4 were disallowed by your good self and the remaining four were refused to be answered. It appeared as though we were unwilling to answer all these four questions. My friend Sri Iman wanted to launch an attack saying that there is something fishy and that it is not complimentary. In the previous session we have answered a number of short notice questions. This time the session will close today and in view of the short period at our disposal we could not get the necessary information to answer the supplementaries. It is not a matter to be made much of.

Sri K. S. VASAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—Out of eight short notice questions, you have been pleased to admit a few, probably with the consent of the Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:—No, no.

Sri K. S. VASAN.—The rule says that with the consent of the Minister the Chair will admit.

*Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—In fact it implies that the moment it is admitted it is to be answered. It is only after taking his consent admission can be made. But when once they are admitted, it means that they have given their consent. Please read the rule.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಆರ್. ನಾಯ್ಡು (ಮಲ್ಲೇಶ್ವರ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮನವಿ. ಹಿಂದಿನ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೂ ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಈ ಸಭಾಧಿವೇಶನವನ್ನು ಈ ಕಬ್ಬದ ಎದುರಿಗೆ ನಿರ್ಮಿತವಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವ ಹೊಸ ವಿಧಾನಸೌಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಆದಷ್ಟು ಜಾಗ್ರತೆ ನಡೆಸುವುದಾಗಿ ಭರವಸೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು. ಆದರೆ ಆ ಭರವಸೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೈಗೂಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಮುಂದಿನ ಅಧಿವೇಶನವಾದರೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಯುವಂತೆ ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿ ನಮಗೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಿಳಿವಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಡ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಿನಂತಿ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ನಾವೆಲ್ಲ prepared ಆಗಿ ಬರಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That will be kept in view by the Government.

Sri K. S. VASAN.—The rule says—'only after obtaining the consent of the Minister concerned'. So evidently, in these cases, four have been admitted after obtaining consent; later they were not answered because they were not willing to answer.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A statement has been made already about this. I will make the position clear. Regarding admissibility, I first find out whether it is admissible under the rules. But I will not admit for answers any short notice question unless the Minister concerned gives his consent to it. Therefore that interpretation should not be forgotten. First, I will formally find out whether it is admissible or not. Then, I will send it to the Minister concerned for approval. If he is not in a position to answer, he will say 'no'. Then, it will not be admitted in the correct sense of the term.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—We are adjourning today. I would like to know whether the session is going to be adjourned or prorogued and when we are likely to meet again.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That you will know shortly.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I thought this was the best time to know that, because we are busy trying to get the T.A.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—If it is going to be adjourned, that is one thing. If it is going to be prorogued, then it is a different matter. Last time it was adjourned, members were allowed to send some six questions for the adjourned meeting of the Assembly. So that is an important factor which we would like to know whether the session is going to be adjourned and whether the privilege which was given to us last time will be given this time also.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If it is prorogation of the Assembly, it comes within the purview of His Highness the Rajpramukh. Therefore we cannot debate on it. I will let you know shortly about this matter. The matter is placed before me just now.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE.

Postponed Questions and Answers.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table of the House replies to 3 questions of October session 1952, one question of July-August 1953 and 34 questions of Budget Session 1954 which have been treated as postponed questions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes, they will all be printed in today's proceedings.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY.—On a point of order Sir. According to today's programme of business, item No. 2 says.

> "Sri K. Hanumanthaiya (Leader of the House) to lay on the Table of the House replies to questions of the previous Sessions treated as postponed questions."

I would like to know whether Sri Kadidal Manjappa, the Hon'ble the Revenue Minister has any power under the rules to lay on the Table of the House these replies to questions of the previous sessions treated as postponed questions, when that was to be done, as per the agenda, by Sri K. Hanumanthaiya as Leader of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is very clear and I do not think the Hon'ble Member has followed the procedure properly.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—(Molakulmuru).—It was the convention of the House that when questions were postponed they were answered in the next session as though they were direct questions. Now, to lay them on the table means to refuse us the right to put supplementaries on those questions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No, no.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I would like to know whether such a procedure was not being adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So far as the point of order raised by Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy is concerned, the procedure

that has been followed till now is quite clear. Any Member of the Government on behalf of any other Member of the Government can lay on the Table of the House papers or move even motions.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಈಗ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೂ ಪರವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಗಬಹುದು, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ.

POSTPONED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

October Session, 1952.

Formation of Road from Chitrahalli to Kolalu.

Q.—153. Sri G. SIVAPPA (Holalkere).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether the road from Chitrahalli *via* Horekedevapura, Nandanahosur, Upparigenhalli to Kolalu in Holalkere Taluk was surveyed ;

(*b*) total length of this road ;

(*c*) whether any grant has been given by the Government ;

(*d*) whether earthwork is completed ; if so, who have done this ?

A:—Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—

(*a*) Yes. An Estimate for Rs. 1,75,000 for the formation of the road is prepared.

(*b*) 18 miles.

(*c*) No. The proposal for the formation of the road was deferred.

(*d*) Does not arise in view of reply to (*c*).

Famine Relief Works.

Q.—210. Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY (Bagepalli-Gudibanda).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

the amount of money spent in Kolar District on the famine relief works during the year 1952 with taluk and villagewise particulars of money spent, kind and quantity of work done, number of men employed and wages paid ?

A.—Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—

(*a*) (i) The amount of money spent on Distress Relief Works in Kolar District, talukwise is given below (from 1st April 1952 to 1st October 1952).

District	*Amount* Rs.
Kolar ...	79,805
Bangarapet ...	1,10,581
Malur ...	9,207
Mulbagal ...	1,99,130
Srinivaspur ...	1,69,616
Chintamani ...	2,42,835
Siddlaghatta ...	1,14,075
Chickballapur ...	58,277
Goribidnur ...	1,05,286
Bagepally ...	1,27,394
Gudibanda ...	83,411
Total ...	12,99,617

(ii) The following kinds of works were undertaken.

(*a*) Sinking and deepening of wells, Gokattes and talapariges,

(*b*) Repairs and desilting of feeder channels,

(*c*) Repairs and desilting of tanks,

(*d*) Construction of roads,

(iii) Number of works executed (earth work mostly) ... 1,937

(iv) Number of men employed. 50,000

(v) Wages paid.

(*a*) *Daily wages* :

Re. 0-10-0 per male cooly.

Re. 0-8-0 per female cooly and a boy above 12 years of age.